

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 5-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US 6,417,899).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-4 are allowable.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 5, 8 and 12 to further define the invention, and canceled claims 6, 9, 15 and 17. Accordingly, claims 1~5, 7, 8, 10~14 are pending for consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 5-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US 6,417,899). Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 5, 8 and 12 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter over the cited references in that each of these claims recite a combination of elements including, for example, “... a common electrode formed on the polarizing film, wherein the polarizing film contacts the color filter and black matrix” in claims 5 and 8, and “a polarizing film contacting at least one of the pixel electrode and the common electrode for transmitting light vibrating in one direction, wherein the polarizing film contacts at least one of a passivation layer on the thin film transistor substrate and the black matrix of the color filter substrate” in claim 12. In independent claims 5 and 8, the polarizing film contacts the common electrode, the color filter and the black matrix and enables the thickness and fabricating steps of the liquid crystal display device to reduce. Also, the polarizing film in independent claim 12 contacts at least one of the pixel electrode and the

common electrode and at least one of a passivation layer of the thin film transistor substrate and the black matrix of the color filter substrate, thereby reducing the thickness and fabricating steps of the liquid crystal display device. As best apparently understood, Jones et al. fails to disclose the polarizing film as claimed in claims 5, 8 and 12.

In view of these points, Applicant asserts that independent claims 5, 8 and 12 are allowable. Furthermore, dependent claims 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14, which depend directly upon claim 5, 8 or 12, are now in clear condition for allowance.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-14.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 054358-5015  
Application No. 10/673,242  
Page 9

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Mary Jane Boswell  
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: September 24, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000